

QUESTION NUMBER	DRAFT RFP SECTION NUMBER	COMMENTS/QUESTIONS/SUGGESTIONS
<b>GENERAL:</b>		
1	N/A	Would GSA please consider adding the following NAICS to a Pool or adding a Pool to cover IT Support Services. In particular these: 517110, 517210, 517919, 518210, 519190, 541511, 541512, 541513, 541519 (emphasis on 541512) Adding a few of these NAICS would make driving business to the vehicle easier for IT companies and provide more opportunities.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No. OASIS and OASIS SB are not IT contracts. Any requirement that would be represented by those NAICS codes should not be performed under OASIS or OASIS SB.
2	N/A	Would GSA consider adding NAICS that have a higher ceiling for small businesses (ex. 54152 has a ceiling of \$25M for small businesses)? We are just above the \$14M and would have to compete in the unrestricted procurement which makes it more difficult to compete against the larger firms for the slots allotted.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> OASIS and OASIS SB feature 6 different size standards that include \$14M, \$19M, \$35.5M, 500 employees, 1000 employees, and 1500 employees.
3	N/A	Will the GSA OASIS contract vehicle be a newly completed Multiple Award Contract or will only those contractors who currently have an GSA Schedule be able to compete?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Any Offeror may compete for an OASIS or OASIS SB award regardless of what other contracts they hold.
4	N/A	If I am reading the RFP correctly, subcontractors past performances, experience, etc will NOT be evaluated in the proposal? Can subcontractors be added to the vehicle after time of award?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Any OASIS or OASIS SB prime Contractor may subcontract with any company they deem appropriate in response to task order solicitations. OASIS and OASIS SB primes do not have to "add" them to their master contract.
5	A.1.1. FAR 52.215-3 Request for Information or Solicitation for Planning Purposes (OCT 1997) page 8	This vehicle could incentivize contractors to bring work to this vehicle just so they can keep their minimum of 3 TO requirement but then again if it's not sole sourced to the contractor why would I want to help another Prime to reach their 3 TO requirement, if I should lose?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Any Offeror who does not want to compete for task orders should refrain from submitting a proposal on OASIS or OASIS SB. Competition at the task order level is a fundamental element of these contracts.
<b>CLARIFICATIONS:</b>		
1	Offeror's Proposal Checklist, Section J.4, Attachment (4)	Section L.5.1, #5 it clearly says that small business offerors are ineligible for an award if they do not have an existing CTA. Why is no CTA grounds for being ineligible?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> You seem to be misinterpreting this. Please note the "if applicable" labeling. Existing CTAs only apply to existing Joint Ventures competing for an OASIS or OASIS SB award. This does not apply to individual companies.
2	Section J.4	On page 4 of the questionnaire checklist, question 2—we would appreciate some clarification. Are you asking if the average per year value is \$2M, \$3M, \$4M, or \$5M? As an example of our interpretation, if we have a project that spanned 3 years and had the following values each year of the contract: 1) Base Year: \$1M, 2) Option Year 1: \$5M, 3) Option Year 2: \$3M. Total Value of this example is \$9M with an average over the 3 years of \$3M/year so would we check the \$3M box for that past performance project? Are we interpreting this question correctly?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> You are interpreting that correctly. We are asking for the average value per year of each requirement.
3	L.5.1.2 / Page 78	Section J.3., Attachment 3 asks us to select the pools that we desire to be considered for. Can a company compete and potentially receive awards both as a SB in pools 4, 5 & 6 and also as a LB (unrestricted) in pools 1, 2 & 3?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We read this question as asking if a company can apply for both OASIS and OASIS SB, but for different Pools on each contract. The answer to that question is definitely "yes".
4	G.2.6, Page 28	Are the Corporate OASIS SB Program Manager (COPM) and Corporate OASIS SB Contract Manager (COCM) anticipated to be full-time or part-time employees? Can these individuals have other corporate responsibilities, or do they have to be solely dedicated to OASIS?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We have no expectations or authority regarding the employment status of Key Personnel. We only expect that the contract requirements be provided. If a contractor chooses to give OASIS Key Personnel other corporate responsibilities, that is fine. However, additional duties will not be considered as an excuse for not carrying out OASIS responsibilities.
5	G.2.6, Page 28	Does the Government intend to pay for key personnel, or would that responsibility fall to the contractor?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please refer to the last sentence of Section G.2.6, which states, "All costs associated with the COPM and COCM shall be at no direct cost to the Government."
6	G.3.1, Page 30	What does the Government anticipate the Contract Access Fee (CAF) will be in terms of percentage?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> This is an issue being vetted within GSA right now and is yet to be determined. The CAF will absolutely be no more than the .75% currently charged for other GSA vehicles, but OASIS may utilize a different approach. More to follow on this issue.
7	H.6.2, Page 43; Attachment J.4, Page 2	Section H.6.2 indicates that contractors "are encouraged to have an acceptable estimating system", which suggests that this requirement is desired but optional. However, Section L.5.5 of Attachment J.4 (Offeror's Proposal Checklist) indicates that an answer of "NO" for Question 2 regarding the estimating system makes an offeror ineligible for award. Is an acceptable estimating system a mandatory requirement for award?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The checklist contains a typo. Estimating systems are not required. Thank you for the catch.

8	H.7.4, Page 49	Please provide additional clarification regarding the Government's expectations regarding the development of marketing materials. Other than OASIS-specific brochures, what materials are expected to be developed? Will the Contractor or the Government be responsible for the cost of the development of these materials?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No materials other than an OASIS-specific brochure and contractor website are expected to be developed. Any and all marketing materials are to be provided at the sole expense of the contractor. We will clarify this in the solicitation.
9	H.6.6, page 44	ISO 9001 Certification - Necessary to bid for award of Prime for SB MAC Contract (or just to bid on Task Orders)?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No. The citation states that Contractors are "encouraged" to have this certification. Please also see Sections L and M for Pass/Fail Evaluation Criteria.
10	H.6.8, page 45	CMML - Necessary to bid for award of Prime for SB MAC Contract (or just to bid on Task Orders)?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No. The citation states that Contractors are "encouraged" to have this certification. Please also see Sections L and M for Pass/Fail Evaluation Criteria.
11	H.6.9, page 45	EVMS - Necessary to bid for award of Prime for SB MAC Contract (or just to bid on Task Orders)?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No. The citation states that Contractors are "encouraged" to have this system. Please also see Sections L and M for Pass/Fail Evaluation Criteria.
12	J.7 and J.9	I notice that there is no DRAFT SECTION J.7 and J.9 in the FBO released documents for OASIS SB. Is that intentional?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes.
13	N/A	I am wondering to what extent GSA has planned to integrate Small Business Innovative Research grantees into its contract issuance/performance goals?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The OASIS Program has no plans to integrate SBIR grantees into our contract award process.
14	OASIS SB - Section H 6.5 Approved Purchasing System - Page 44	Does the government want an approved system or a certified system? An approved system would require a contractor utilize a previously identified list of approved systems. A certified system is a two-fold process that is out of the contractors control. First, a contractor can purchase an approved system, which is based on industry-leading compliant systems. Any system would then need to be certified by DCAA, which comes at the request of an agency, not the contractor. Additionally, wait times for DCAA audited systems is years. Therefore, if a contractor doesn't get an agency to request or sponsor the system compliant, the contractor cannot get it certified. A very large amount of points is assigned to the Purchasing System. Is the intent to have the Purchasing system audited or does the government request contractors utilize an approved system, which would be inclusive of a certain number of systems? If the later, would the government provide the list of approved systems.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are seeking a system audited and certified by DCAA, DCMA, or any other government agency whose responsibility it is to audit and certify a contractor's purchasing system. One of the matters of complexity that OASIS and OASIS SB are attempting to solve revolves around Ancillary Support (commonly referred to as ODCs). The Purchasing System is critical in addressing this and saves Ordering Contracting Officers an enormous amount of time. Accordingly, a significant amount of points were assigned to this particular system. There is no list of Government "approved" or "compliant" systems that we are aware of, regardless of what any marketing material may suggest.
15	OASIS Unrestricted - Section L.5.3.1 - Page 85	Under the requirement of 5 Prime contracts with at least \$5M per year, there will be no participants in Pools 1 & 2 as that is \$25M revenue to meet this requirement, understanding size standards require 3 years average. Is that the governments intent to not utilize the 6 pools?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> You seem to be misinterpreting this. On OASIS, companies may be of any size in any Pool. On OASIS SB, this would be a serious consideration, but not on OASIS.
16	H.3.1	It is noted that OASIS SB is a total small business set-aside contract. Does this mean that a small business cannot have a large business as a sub contractor?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> No. The only limitation for OASIS SB subcontracting is that the OASIS SB Prime contractor must perform at least 50% of the labor performed on the contract. Beyond that, OASIS SB primes may subcontract with whomever they see fit at the task order level.
17	L.5.1.7	Excluding existing CTAs, does GSA want to know about the team? Does the team need to be established at the time of the OASIS SB submittal, or can a team be established dynamically for responding to task orders?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We designed OASIS and OASIS SB to be as flexible as possible in responding to task order solicitations. We are not considering teams at the master contract level.
18	L.5.3.2	Under Section L.5.3.2., Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements, there are five VERY limiting requirements for any SB. #1. You may not use experience from a CTA formed specifically for this opportunity, only JV. #2. All work must have been completed as the prime and not a subcontractor - where much of SB get their work; #3. The prime must provide THREE of the SIX core disciplines on each project; #4 each project must be at least \$2M; and #5 at least one of the five project must have completed as a Cost-Reimbursement contract - which comes with expensive DCAA audited accounting requirements. Please let me know if I am misreading these requirements.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> You are interpreting those requirements correctly except for #3. The relevant experience examples must include 3 of the 6 core disciplines. Those may have been performed by the Prime, a sub, a teaming partner, or whomever. Please bear in mind that we are not looking for every SB to be able to compete for an OASIS SB award. We are looking for the <b>highest</b> technically rated SBs to perform complex requirements. We are looking for SB companies with proven, verifiable success performing complex work as a prime contractor. We are looking for SB companies with the existing systems, certifications, and resources to perform at a high level for these kinds of requirements. Accordingly, the standards are set high. We are certainly open to feedback, but recommendations designed to reduce the standards would only be considered if it is apparent that there would not be a sufficient pool of contractors to compete for the 40 spots we will be awarding in each Pool.

19	L.5.3.1; pg 80	Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements #3: Have a total award value of at least \$2 Million Per Year. Does this refer to each cited contract or does the statement refer to the combined value of the cited contracts?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The \$2M per year applies to each relevant experience reference.
20	L.5.4.2; pg 82	Past Performance: At least Three (3) out of Five (5) past performance projects must be for work that was for the Federal Government under a contract or task order awarded by the Federal Government AND must be the past performance for the same Five (5) relevant experience projects under Section L.5.3.2. Can a bidder cite an IDIQ-type project as a single reference or must the projects cited be just individual task orders within an IDIQ?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> As there is no work performed at the IDIQ level, relevant experience should reference a specific task order or contract where work was actually performed.
21	C.2.1. Core Disciplines page 17	How are the Core Discipline Areas related to the NAICS Pools?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The core disciplines are not related to the Pools. The pools are based upon size standard and only size standard.
22	H.4.2.1. NAICS Pools page 40	Does a SB have to do 3 of the 6 Core Discipline Areas in each of the 6 NAICS Pools to qualify doing work in a particular Pool?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> An SB has to provide a total of 5 samples of relevant experience. These samples are not related to Pools. Pools are only based upon size standard.
23	L.5. PROPOSAL CONTENT page 81	In Section L the requirements for Volume's 3 & 4 are close enough to be combined into one volume, why are they different volumes when essentially the same information is requested?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> While relevant experience and past performance are not the same information, we will take that under advisement.
24	M.3. SCREENING AND EVALUATION PROCESS page 89	In Section M the evaluation process only seems to be a two-step screening process to limit you to the top 40 candidates for each pool and nowhere in either step does it state the relevant experience and past performance is going to be a strong factor in scoring (especially when most sections are Pass/Fail evaluated), can you explain how the process for award will be completed clearly?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please read the entire Section M. Section M.5 clearly indicates the relative scoring for all factors.
25	M.4. ACCEPTABILITY REVIEW PROCESS page 92	If only a contractor is ONLY ENCOURAGED to have certifications than why use it as an evaluation criteria when there will be lopsided results? Will a contractor that has an ENCOURAGED certification be scored with a pass and a contractor without is scored with a fail (again it's only scored on a Pass/Fail evaluation)?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Offerors receive points based upon relevant experience, past performance, and systems, certifications, and resources as specified in Section M.5. Certifications are not evaluated on a pass/fail basis.
		<b>STANDARDS:</b>
1	Section J.4, pages 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8	Item 2 requires each project to exceed at least \$2m per year in total award value or the offeror is ineligible for an award. Why must a small business offeror have 5 eligible projects, each of which must have an annual value of at least \$2m?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Given the price of professional labor, we calculated that the \$2M threshold is probably where requirements start to take on an integrated aspect. OASIS and OASIS SB are new contracts. As such, we have no historical information to pull from. Examining some of our GWAC contracts, it seemed that \$2M/year might actually be a bit low, but gathering feedback is what the draft RFP process is for. If we get substantial feedback that \$2M/year is too high, we'll adjust accordingly.
2	Page 48, Sections H.6.14 & H.6.15	These 2 sections, along with several others clearly indicate that GSA expects there will be teaming for support of OASIS, as these 2 sections each reference 'subcontracting' requirements. This appears to be somewhat contradictory to the requirement in Section L.3 that proposals may only represent the Prime Contractor (except for existing CTA's) for relevant past experience and associated past performance. Is GSA trying to discourage teaming for response to this solicitation?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> To be perfectly clear, we are not allowing teaming at the contract level. However, we are allowing and encouraging teaming at the task order level.
3	Page 48, Sections H.6.14 & H.6.15	Are there any special rules that GSA anticipates it will require for small business who wish to team?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Teaming will not be considered for OASIS or OASIS SB contract level awards.
4	Page 48, Sections H.6.14 & H.6.15	Is GSA aware that many small businesses will need to team, particularly in order to support the ancillary services required to enable a full integrated solution response as outlined in Section C.3 page 20?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Yes, we are aware of the need to team. Teaming will be done at the task order level and primes will be free to team with whomever they deem the best fit for the requirement at the task order level.
5	Page 48, Sections H.6.14 & H.6.15	If a solicitation response is only able to show the experience/past performance of the prime, how is GSA proposing to 'vet' the capabilities/viability of any subcontractors a prime may need in order to provide a comprehensive response?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Teaming will not be considered for OASIS or OASIS SB contract level awards.
6	Page 48, Sections H.6.14 & H.6.15	Why has GSA chosen to present the OASIS solicitation in such a way that subcontracting appears to be significantly less of a factor for concern in review of a prime's overall capabilities?

		<p><b>RESPONSE:</b> Your series of questions concern teaming. There are several reasons that we do not support teaming at the contract level. These include: 1. We do not want to compromise flexibility at the task order level. One of the key elements of OASIS and OASIS SB is flexibility at the task order level. Accordingly, we do not want to implement teaming arrangements at the contract level that may not be the best teaming arrangement for individual task order requirements. 2. The Government has no privity of contract with subcontractors or teaming partners, which means that the teaming agreement could literally be changed the day after award. We do not feel that basing an OASIS or OASIS SB award on something that could evaporate the day after award is a sound approach. 3. Our experience and feedback received indicate that teaming arrangements at the contract level generally turn into paperwork exercises and that many team members that were used to get a contract award are never actually utilized in performance under that contract. 4. We are searching for businesses with an actual history of performance, not the promise of what a group of contractors might be able to do. We are very firm in our opinion on this.</p>
7	Page 48, Sections H.6.14 & H.6.15	<p>Given these questions, should a prime still consider responding to the OASIS RFI solicitation with the 'full team' capabilities, even though past experience/past performance of the undisclosed subcontractors will not be presented within the context of the response?; 7) If the answer to question 6 is 'NO', can GSA advise how the issue of subcontracting will be addressed in the context of the future RFP (i.e., solicitation) that will follow this RFI?; 8) if the answer to question 6 is 'YES', can GSA advise how it expects primes to appropriately and fully incorporate the use of subcontractors in its RFI (and future RFP) solicitation responses without addressing any subcontractor past experience in its solicitation response?</p>
		<p><b>RESPONSE:</b> Teaming will not be considered for OASIS or OASIS SB contract level awards. Proposals submitted from "teams" who are not pre-existing entities shall not be considered.</p>
		<b>SCORING:</b>
1	L.5.4.3 / Page 87	<p>As a successful SB, we have only recently become ineligible to compete as a SB under certain NAICS codes. Since we don't qualify as a SB under all the OASIS NAICS, we would like to compete for an OASIS award under the unrestricted RFP. As a SB Prime BPA holder, we established and met or exceeded our socio-economic goals. However, since it was a SB award, we were not required to report it. Therefore, we could not gain any points in the scoring for this paragraph. Is there an alternative for a transitioning SB to get credit for meeting socio-economic goals?</p>
		<p><b>RESPONSE:</b> No. In accordance with the feedback we received from both Industry and clients, we geared the evaluation strategy towards rewarding actual performance, but also tried to provide ample flexibility in the scoring system to overcome situations like you mention. Any suggestions you might have will definitely be considered.</p>
		<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>
1	H.3.1, Page 39	<p>We recommend that the Government consider reducing or eliminating set-asides for specific socio-economic groups, as it may reduce competition and otherwise eliminate companies that may be able to offer the best value to the Government for a particular task order. Should the government decide to keep these set-asides, then we suggest that the Government include other specific socio-economic groups, such as Minority-Owned, Small Disadvantaged Businesses.</p>
		<p><b>RESPONSE:</b> Thank you for the input, but we disagree with the recommendation. The OASIS Program fully supports the small business community as a whole, including all socio-economic groups specifically identified and authorized for set-asides in the FAR. Taking the position that conducting set-asides reduces competition is akin to saying that there should be no OASIS SB, as that is a 100% set-aside. We simply disagree with that position. With regards to what groups are eligible for set-aside, that is an issue determined by regulation, not by our choice. We are allowing all set-asides authorized by the FAR.</p>
2	H.7.5, Page 50	<p>We suggest that the Government remove the requirement of attaining a minimum of three task order awards for the exercise of Option 1. While we understand the necessity of having active and involved contractors within the OASIS pools, individual contractors do not have control over the number or type of opportunities that will be offered to each pool. It is possible that three or more appropriate opportunities for a contractor's skill set may not materialize over the first five-year period, yet that contractor may still offer services or solutions that would provide value to the government for emerging needs during the option period.</p>
		<p><b>RESPONSE:</b> There are two issues to address here. 1. We do not feel that winning 3 task orders within a 5 year period is overly burdensome for OASIS SB contract holders. Where applicable and within scope, we expect OASIS and OASIS SB contract holders to bring their existing business to the OASIS contracts and a five year time frame is ample time to do so. If a SB contractor cannot win 3 task orders within a 5 year window, then we feel that OASIS SB may not be a good fit for that contractor and we may attempt to find a different contractor who might be more successful. 2. Simply because we reserve the right to do something in the contract, doesn't mean that we have to. Regarding any contract performance issue, the OASIS team plans to collaborate extensively with the Contractor prior to invoking Dormant Status, Off-Ramping, and/or not exercising an option. We will be fair and reasonable with all OASIS and OASIS SB Contractors after award and want nothing more than the shared success of all members of our extended OASIS family.</p>

3	H.11.1 and H.11.2, Pages 53-55	We recommend that the Government remove the requirement that the contractor "demonstrate successful performance under the OASIS SB contract" in order to be eligible for lateral or vertical pool ramping. While it makes sense to require successful performance should a contractor be awarded a task order, it is possible that a contractor's organic growth independent of OASIS may occur prior to receiving a task order award, thereby making the contractor ineligible to bid on future task orders. Under the draft requirements, this contractor would essentially be "locked in" without the ability to move to a new pool because they do not have a track record with OASIS and will not have the opportunity to achieve that track record due to their growth. This situation may create a disincentive for contractors to seek inclusion in a particular pool if there is not sufficient flexibility for growth and success.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> OASIS SB contractors will not recertify size standard until the 5 year point. A contractor will be required to win at least 3 task orders by this point. Accordingly, we feel that the suggestion is moot.
4	L.2.3, Page 73	We recommend that the Government increase the number of awards in each pool. We believe a larger pool of qualified companies will provide greater competition and better potential value to the Government.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We selected 40 contractors based on our historic IDIQ experience. We will closely monitor competition levels at the task order level and on-ramp additional contractors when and if that becomes necessary.
5	L.3, Page 74	We recommend that the Government allow proposals for teaming arrangements (including prime and subcontractor arrangements) for OASIS. As the Government is seeking business-based solutions through OASIS, rather than technology-specific solutions, offerors may be able to provide more comprehensive solutions through a teaming arrangement. This is especially true for small businesses, as small businesses by necessity tend to be more specialized entities than larger, full-service firms.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Please see Standards question #6 for the OASIS team opinion regarding teaming.
6	L.5.3.1, Page 80	We recommend that the Government remove the requirement that the primary scope of the relevant experience projects be within one of the six OASIS Core Disciplines (Minimum Condition 1). Our rationale is that the six core disciplines are fundamental components of numerous government contracts, but are not always framed as such within the RFQ or contract documentation. For example, a contract may have a stated primary scope such as "implementing an IT system". This hypothetical contract may include Program Management, Management Consulting, Engineering, and Logistics as fundamental aspects/tasks, but they are not defined as such within the statement of scope. We suggest that should the Government wish to retain the requirement, the contractor should be allowed to demonstrate that the relevant project incorporated these core disciplines even if they were not specifically designated as the "primary scope".
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> While we understand the rationale for your recommendation, we have reservations about considering an experience project as "relevant" when it could not be performed under the OASIS or OASIS SB contract.
7	Section M, M.5, Pages 89-96	As a general matter, we believe that the evaluation criteria overemphasize certifications and form as opposed to substantive experience and capability. For example, several of the evaluation criteria award a considerable amount of points for items such as past performance contract size and various certifications. This criteria may not be the most appropriate for the OASIS Small Business vehicle, as many small businesses have not yet had the opportunity to service large contracts or pursue official certifications due to financial and business reasons, even though the company may incorporate standards and industry best practices (such as ISO 9001 and CMMI) into its management and technical processes. We believe the evaluation criteria, as currently structured, may unnecessarily eliminate many qualified companies and reduce the overall level of competition. We believe that more emphasis should be placed on the substantive nature of past experience and current capabilities to provide a high level of service, rather than contract value and formal certification.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> The scoring system places the highest amount of points on Past Performance. The second highest amount of points rests with Relevant Experience. Finally, Systems, Certifications, and Resources account for the lowest amount of potential points. We are not looking for all businesses to receive an OASIS or OASIS SB award. We are looking for companies who have actual relevant experience, actual successful performance, and existing systems, certifications, and resources. An Offeror who claims to incorporate the standards of ISO 9001 is not the equivalent of an Offeror who has been certified for doing so. Finally, the scoring system does not eliminate any Offeror, it only distinguishes between Offerors, which is what the source selection process is all about. We are looking for the Highest Technically Rated Offerors in these solicitations. We feel this evaluation approach will be successful in finding those Offerors.
8	OASIS SB - Section L.5.3.1 Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements - Pages 80-81	I think the requirements are too difficult for many small businesses to attain. Small businesses often have a balance of prime and sub work, where subcontracting is the starting point and usually the larger portion of work as you need the past performance prior to bidding prime work. Requiring 5 distinct Prime contracts having a value of at least \$2M a year is a challenge for many small businesses. First, 5 Prime contracts of at least \$2M a year would mean you have most likely already outgrown the \$14M NAICS size standard (assuming subcontracting work too), which would eliminate participants in Pool 1. Additionally, having 5 Prime contracts of that size within the scope of OASIS is a high hurdle for any potential Pool 1-3 candidates. Suggest requiring 1 or 2 contracts of the \$2M size standard vs. all 5 Prime contracts.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Thank you for the feedback and we will take it under consideration.



9	OASIS SB and Unrestricted - Section L.5.3.1 Relevant Experience Minimum Requirements - Pages 80-81	Cost-Reimbursement requirement is a high hurdle for businesses of any size. This is out of the control of the contractor. If the acquisition departments within the agencies we support prefer Labor Hours or Firm Fixed Price, we can't possibly obtain Cost-Reimbursement Contracts. If the scope of OASIS is to determine contractors who have the past performance and personnel who can perform the work, the mode of the contract shouldn't be considered. If the firm has a DCAA approved financial system, then Cost-Reimbursable contracts are feasible. Suggest lifting this requirement on both OASIS SB and OASIS Unrestricted.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> Cost Reimbursement work is dominant in the field of professional services. Approximately half the dollars spent in professional services Government-wide was spent on a cost reimbursable basis. Audited accounting systems are required to perform this kind of work and having an audited accounting system is a firm requirement of this contract and the clients it will serve.
10	OASIS SB and Unrestricted - Section L.5.3.1 - pages 80-81 SB, 85 Unrestricted	The requirement for involvement and / or integration of 4 out of the 6 OASIS Core Disciplines in the Unrestricted and 3 out of the 6 in the OASIS SB is very restricted. How will the government evaluate as this is dependent upon how the statement of work is worded, how the acquisition office awards tasks (i.e., they may separate the work streams), and assume the timing of all work streams aligns. Understanding the government would like to obtain companies that have performed these complex tasks, the current requirements are very restrictive and do not necessarily relate to the most qualified companies. Suggest removing this requirement from all 5 Prime contracts to 1 Prime Contract. This would provide the government with the past performance demonstrating the integration of the OASIS disciplines has occurred.
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We have allowed for not only the Statement of Work to be provided to validate performance of core disciplines, but also contractor proposals as well. Additionally, you can provide Performance Work Statements, Statements of Objectives, and/or Work Breakdown Structures for validation. There should be some indication of the core disciplines you have performed within one or more of these documents.
11	L.5.3.1	It is noted that small businesses must have five distinct past performances as a prime contractor. Can this be modified to be five distinct past performances as either a prime contractor or a subcontractor?
		<b>RESPONSE:</b> We are in the draft mode right now, so anything is possible, but we asked for Prime experience because we wanted contractors with the ability to win requirements, put together teams, and be responsible for the outcomes. This is very important to us and our clients as well.